DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 217 CS 503 785

AUTHOR Copeland, Gary A.; Adams, R. C.
TITLE An Evaluation of Gender and Psychological Sex Type as Variables in Communication Research.
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Milwaukee, WI, April 15-17, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Communication Research; Persuasive Discourse; *Predictor Variables; *Psychological Characteristics; *Research Methodology; *Sex Differences; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS Communication Apprehension; *Interpersonal Communication

ABSTRACT

An individual may be sex typed (masculine male or feminine female), cross typed (masculine female or feminine male), or not sex typed (androgynous or undifferentiated). The use of psychological sex typing, in place of or in addition to gender, as an independent or mediating variable should, given reliable measurement, enhance the validity of research results by a more detailed accounting for the variance of the dependent variables. With this in mind, a study investigated two questions. (1) Does analysis of dependent measures over psychological sex type produce results meaningfully different from those obtained when using the traditional breakout by sex and, if so, what differences are observed? (2) Since the traits under study are inferred from performance on paper and pencil measures and are presumed to have social roots, what relationships are observed among them? Data were gathered from 86 college students enrolled in a basic course in interpersonal communication. Among the results is an indication that the combination of gender and sex-type variables improves the accounting for the variance only nominally, and that the use of sex type variable provides opportunity for the formulation of more precise theoretical constructions. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED214217

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

AN EVALUATION OF GENDER AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SEX TYPE AS VARIABLES IN COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

Gary A. Copeland
Doctoral Candidate
Speech Communication Department
The Pennsylavania State University

R. C. Adams
Professor
Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
California State University, Fresno

Communication Theory Top Four Program
Central States Speech Association
Milwaukie, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary A. Copeland

R.C. Adams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503785

AN EVALUATION OF GENDER AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SEX TYPE AS VARIABLES IN COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

A major difficulty in attempting to draw conclusions about differences between men and women on a variety of dependent variables in contemporary research is attributable to socio-psychological changes that have affected perceptions of sex roles. While human biology has remained relatively stable, socially acceptable behavior for men and women has been changing fairly rapidly. Although the majority of contemporary communication research continues to consider the more static dimension (gender or physiological sex), some communication researchers have begun to explore the more dynamic dimension (psychological sex type), in empirical terms.[1] This report presents the results of an evaluation of gender and psychological sex typing as independent or mediating variables in relation to two established communication variables: communication apprehension and persuasibility. Two research questions guided the investigation:

1) Does analysis of dependent measures over psychological sex type produce results meaningfully different from those obtained when using the traditional breakout by sex and, if so, what differences are observed?

2) Since the traits under study are inferred from performances on "paper-and-pencil" measures and are presumed to have social roots, what relationships are observed among them?

Implications for communication theory and research are discussed in light of the results.

Psychological Sex Types

The use of learned characteristics to explain reported gender differences in a variety of research dates back at least to 1937, when Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb noted, "It is patent that whatever differences have as yet been found are the result, not of biological, but of cultural factors. The question of sex differences must therefore be at least as complex as are cultural variations within our civilization."[2] So, while psychological/cultural factors have long been attributed causes for observed differences between men and women, the operationalization of the variable has continued to be almost exclusively biological.

In an attempt to recognize the changing social roles of men and women and to operationalize the psychological sex types, masculine and feminine, instruments to assess sex typing (androgyny) have been developed.[3] Two assumptions underly psychological sex types as they are presently conceived: a) masculinity and femininity are discrete constellations of traits, not polar extremes of a single continuum and b) every person possesses both masculine and feminine traits to varying degrees.[4]

These two assumptions provide the theoretical basis for three basic categories and six psychological sex types. An individual may be sex typed (masculine male or feminine female), cross typed (masculine female or feminine male), or not sex typed (androgynous or undifferentiated). Androgynous persons, originally characterized by any balance of masculine and feminine qualities, are now defined in terms of endorsement of a high number of both masculine and feminine qualities while the undifferentiated are distinguished by endorsement of a low number of both.[5] Masculine and feminine tendencies are sometimes identified, also, pro-

viding four more types and a higher level of differentiation (masculine tending males/females and feminine tending females/males). These two additional categories comprise those who are not clearly androgynous or sex typed.

Strongly sex-typed persons have been shown to exhibit limiting traits. A number of studies have examined the relationship between self esteem and femininity.[6] Spence et al. and Cristall and Dean found androgynous persons to be higher in self esteem than masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated people.[7] The ability of highly sex-typed individuals to adopt new behaviors has been studied by Bem and Lenney. They found strongly sex-typed individuals limited in the range of new behaviors in which they will engage.[8]

The use of psychological sex typing, in place of or in addition to gender, as an independent or mediating variable should, given reliable measurement, enhance the validity of research results by a more detailed accounting for the variance of the dependent variable(s). Also, it should improve the power of communication theory as a consequence of more precise propositions being developed from the findings of such research.

Communication Apprehension

A significant amount of research over the past four decades has focused on anxiety about oral communication. This research has been conducted under a number of different labels such as reticence,[9] audience sensitivity,[10] unwillingness to communicate,[11] stage fright,[12] and communication apprehension.[13] This study dealt with the communication apprehension (CA) construct as McCroskey has defined it: "an individual's

level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons."[14]

Females have typically been noted to exhibit higher levels of CA than males. Results from the first self-report instrument for CA--The Personal Report of Confidence While Speaking--were that females reported less confidence than males.[15] Clevenger, in his review of the stage fright literature, reported a consistent pattern of males exhibiting less stage fright than females on self-report measures.[16] Porter found that females reported more fear on a paper-and-pencil instrument--Communication Fear Scale--and exhibited higher and faster physiological arousal than males.[17] Bruskin, in a nationwide survey, reported 46% of female respondents, versus 36% of males, checked "speaking before a group" as one of their common fears.[18] Anderson, Anderson, and Garrison found that female college students and female primary and secondary teachers reported higher levels of CA than did their male counterparts on the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension.[19] A similar sex difference was observed by Garrison and Garrison among elementary and secondary students.[20]

CA appears to be a correlate of other socially and psychologically limiting traits. A negative relationship for CA with self esteem and with self acceptance has been noted by several researchers.[21] The ability to be innovative or show a willingness to change has also been found to correlate negatively with CA.[22] Thus, both the communication apprehensive and the sex typed appear to share certain limiting traits.

Persuasibility

The large body of research on persuasibility has provided con-

flicting evidence about the persuasibility of the sexes.[23] Eagly noted recently that social psychology and communication texts typically claim women tend to be more persuasible than men while the empirical literature typically finds no significant difference between the sexes.[24] To illustrate: Cronkhite wrote in his persuasion text, "The evidence seems to indicate overwhelmingly that women are generally more persuadable than men,"[25] while Bostrom and Kemp stated in their research report that, "No clear evidence seems available concerning the role that sex differences play in persuasibility"[26]--both in 1969. Those researchers who have claimed evidence for greater persuasibility on the part of women cite varying reasons for their differing from men--e. g., female docility,[27] male dominance,[28] female emotionality,[29] lower self confidence and self esteem among females,[30] and female openness to conformity.[31]

Rosenfeld and Christie have suggested that, "the manner in which men and women are raised to fulfill certain roles, and the rigidity with which they are forced into those roles, have vacillated during periods of our history."[32] As supporting evidence, they provide a chronological summary of selected persuasibility studies. Eagly's historically tabled listing of persuasive-effects studies is corroborative of the Rosenfeld and Christie suggestion. Casting the studies listed by Eagly into a 2 x 2 contingency table--females more persuasible versus no significant difference by pre-1967 versus post-1966 publication dates--statistical support for this view is obtained ($\phi = .479$, $\underline{x}^2 = 10.80$, $\underline{df} = 1$, $\underline{p} = .005$).[33] This provides limited empirical support for the claim, above, that the behaviors of men and women may be changing. The principle limitation, of

course, is that this analysis does not take into account any variety of instrumentation employed in operationalizing the persuasibility variable over the several studies.

Women would seem no longer to need to adopt the old stereotyped behaviors of femininity--e. g., docility, submission. The change in attitudes towards what are acceptable behaviors for men and women may be a precursor of changes in the culture as to how men and women respond to the forces of social influence. Just as yielding to the suasive influence of others may have been socially accepted behavior pattern for women in the past, an autonomous, assertive independence may become a socially accepted behavior pattern for women in the future.

Hypotheses

A review of the literature revealed psychological sex types have been used in one prior study of CA. Greenblatt, Hasenauer, and Freimuth reported that sex typing is more precise in determining differences in reported CA than gender. While they studied differences among sex types, they failed to evaluate CA by gender (males and females) versus psychological sex type (masculine and feminine).[34]

Also, Montgomery and Burgoon investigated the impact of sex type on susceptibility to persuasive messages. Using a unique assessment of persuasibility, they found no main effect for gender but did report an interaction effect between gender and sex type; they concluded, "Androgyny does appear to be an elusive mediating variable, knowledge of which adds precision to prediction concerning the effect of messages attempting to induce attitude change."[35] In a second study, they investigated message expectation and

resistance to persuasive communication in terms of gender and psychological sex type. The results of this study also support further evaluation of sex typing and gender.[36]

Neither of the questions posed at the outset has been directly addressed by prior research. To evaluate these variables comparatively in the context of contemporary theory, hypotheses were derived to provide answers to the two research questions. Each is a two-in-one hypothesis in that matched null alternatives were tested for each of the dependent variables. The research hypotheses were:

H_1 ANOVA main effects will be significant for both independent variables (sex type and gender) on each dependent variable (CA/persuasibility) with a more meaningful accounting for variance being produced by psychological sex types than by gender.

H_2 Because the three scaled traits under study here are believed to have common roots in the socialization process and are assessed in comparatively similar fashion, they will be significantly correlated.

METHODOLOGY

Data utilized in the analyses reported below were gathered from 86 students--35 males, 51 females--enrolled in a basic course in interpersonal communication at a state university in the West. Data collection was undertaken during regularly scheduled class periods.

Variables were operationalized by the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI),[37] the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA),[38] and

a revised version of the Janis and Field Persuasibility Test(JFPT).[39] Although any instrument or procedure which assesses masculinity and femininity as independent constructs would have been acceptable, the BSRI was selected for its appropriateness in identifying individuals by degree of sex typing. While the BSRI has drawn some criticism (e. g., Pedhazur and Tetenbaum; Locksley and Colton),[40] the substantive arguments against the BSRI have been dealt with by Bem.[41] The BSRI has been used in previous communication research with the variables under scrutiny, facilitating comparability of findings. Finally, factor analysis of the BSRI generally supports its construct validity.[42] The PRCA was selected for its wide use in CA research and to offer some comparability with prior work. The JFPT was selected because its messages have been demonstrated not to be content-bound in their effect nor its topics gender-specific in appeal.[43] It uses paired messages on five different topics and has produced significantly different persuasibility scores for males and females.[44] The original messages in the JFPT were updated; e. g., radio comedians are virtually nonexistent in the U. S., so the messages about a radio comedian were changed to deal with the pending debut on American TV of a British comedian.

BSRI and PRCA scales were scored according to the instructions of their respective developers, producing continuous data satisfying the equal intervals assumption of parametric statistics. JFPT scoring was modified--to take into account the "boomerang" effect--by scoring shifts in opposition to the advocacy of the messages -1 rather than 0, following procedures demonstrated by Adams.[45] The first hypothesis was tested for

each of the two dependent measures by use of the analysis of variance (SPSS subprogram ANOVA, hierarchical model) and the second by the Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient (SPSS subprogram SCATTERGRAM).[46] The criterion level for rejection of the null alternative was set at $p < .05$.

RESULTS

The first independent variable, gender, was dichotomized in the usual fashion based upon self report; the second independent variable, sex type, was polytomized by breaking the range of t ratios derived from the recommended scoring of the BSRI into five categories: masculine typed (-2.021 and below); masculine tending (-2.021 to -1.000); androgynous/undifferentiated[47] (-1.000 to 1.000); feminine tending (1.000 to 2.021); and feminine typed (2.021 and above). The hierarchical analysis of variance model was used to take into account the unequal distribution of cases among cells in this natural breakout of the sample.

For the PRCA data, both main effects exceed the criterion level (gender $F = 11.465$, $df = 1,76$, $p = .001$; sex type $F = 5.681$, $df = 4,76$, $p = .001$); no significant interaction effect was observed. The unadjusted eta was .32 for gender ($eta^2 = .1024$); the unadjusted eta was .55 for sex type ($eta^2 = .3025$). Controlling for the effect of the alternative independent variable, beta was .02 for gender ($beta^2 = .0004$) and .54 for sex type ($beta^2 = .2916$).

A similar outcome obtains for the JFPT data with significant main

effects (gender $F = 4.849$, $df = 1,76$, $p = .031$; sex type $F = 3.014$, $df = 4, 76$, $p = .023$) and no significant interaction effect. The unadjusted eta was .23 for gender ($eta^2 = .0529$) and .41 for sex type ($eta^2 = .1681$). Controlling for the effects of the alternative independent variable, the beta for gender declines to .11 ($beta^2 = .0121$), for sex type to .38 ($beta^2 = .1444$).

Direct interpretation of these main effects is quite clear and straight forward for the PRCA data but is embarassed by noticeable fluctuations in cell means for JFPT data (see Table 1). PRCA cell means are near linear over the sample and over the male responses; the departure of note occurs among cell means for females. For the JFPT data, the masculine sex type respondents, male and female, do produce the lowest mean persuasibility scores; the highest mean persuasibility scores, however, are those for the feminine-tending females followed by the feminine-typed females and the feminine-tending males.

* * * * *

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

* * * * *

For this sample, BSRI and PRCA scores were correlated $r = .539$, sharing just over 29% of their variance in common. BSRI and JFPT scores were correlated $r = .309$, sharing just over 9% of their variance in common. Both coefficients of correlation are significant at well beyond the $p = .05$ level of confidence.

DISCUSSION

Both hypotheses were confirmed. F ratios for main effects were significant for both gender and sex type when assessing CA and persuasibility. On both dependent variables, the variance accounted for by the ANOVA was greater for the psychological-sex-type variable than for gender. Evaluating both predictor variables together did not produce a meaningful gain, the accounting for shared variance improving by less than 1% on PRCA and 4% on JFPT. Departures from linearity in the distributions of the cell means might be attributable to unrepresentative sampling at the level of the (sex type by gender) cells or might, indeed, be reflective of behavior in the general population heretofore unnoticed in the study of gender only. Theoretical inconsistency might seem a sound basis for rejecting the latter interpretation, but the two alternative notions ought to be brought under scrutiny in further investigation of these variables.

The significant relationship between BSRI and each of the dependent measures was predicted, but that for JFPT was notably less meaningful. That BSRI and PRCA measures share nearly a third of their variance in common contributes to the convergent validity of both scales in that the conceptualizations underlying them presume essentially the same cultural forces to be operative in producing these traits and their assessment is accomplished in similar fashion--i. e., by self-report scales built upon a verbal base. That JFPT is not a self-report scale, but an independent assessment of the persuasibility trait through responses to messages, may explain in part the lower-level relationship with BSRI;

that a significant relationship is observed may well be attributed to the presumed common cultural roots of the traits. (JFPT and PRCA correlated $r = .264$, $df = 85$, $p = .007$; $r^2 = .0697$ or 7% common variance).

The accounting for variance over five categories of people is clearly more precise than has been available in communication research which acknowledged sex as a mediating variable or attempted to treat it as an independent variable. Combining the gender and sex-type variables in these analyses improves the accounting for variance only nominally--i. e., psychological sex type offers greater explanatory power than gender, but joint use of the two variables is unnecessarily redundant.

Use of the sex-type variable provides opportunity for the formulation of more precise theoretical constructions. The gender main effect from the present study clearly replicates earlier findings that males tend to be less persuasible than females (when assessed by JFPT) and to report less CA. The sex-type main effect equally clearly indicates that men most closely fitting cultural stereotypes for males are least persuasible and lowest in self reports of CA and that women who fit the masculine BSRI pattern seem to possess these traits to the same extent as the masculine men. At the other end of the stereotypical range, women who best fit the socially supported feminine sex type, as identified by the BSRI, do tend to be more persuasible and clearly to report more CA and men who fit the feminine BSRI pattern seem to share in these traits to much the same extent as the women. More extensive work might profitably investigate the fit of males and females in all categories of the BSRI in terms of persuasibility and CA. And, a variety of other communication variables will similarly benefit from this same degree of more refined

analysis in the interests of improved communication theory capable of maintaining currency in a dynamic society.

Sex differences have often been reported as though they were examined as an afterthought[48]; but, from planned study or not, previously identified sex differences need to be re-conceptualized in terms of sex types and studied in relation to all major communication variables where even modest sex differences have been noted--perhaps, also, where near significant results have been obtained. Sex-based norms suffer some loss of validity in view of the present findings--for some purposes; assessment tools normed to the sexes may need to be re-evaluated in this expanded context. As new generations mature in a dynamic social environment that has potential for acculturating increasing numbers of people androgynously, a decline in numbers of sex-typed people could produce a population radically different from the one on which norms were established; sex typing provides a basis for more enduring assessment norms.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Cf., Sue DeWine, "Androgyny and Communication: An Overview," in Communication Yearbook 4, edited by Dan Nimmo (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1980), pp. 657-658; see also Jane Delano Brown, "Adolescent Peer Group Communication, Sex-role Norms and Decisions about Occupations," in Nimmo, pp. 678-679; Linda L. Putnam and Linda McCallister, "Situational Effects of Task and Gender on Nonverbal Display," in Nimmo, pp. 679-697; Terrance L. Albrecht and Ralph E. Cooley, "Androgyny and Communication Strategies for Relational Dominance: An Empirical Analysis," in Nimmo, pp. 699-710; William Iches and Richard D. Barnes, "Boys and Girls Together and Alienated: On Enacting Stereotyped Sex-roles in Mixed Sex Dyads," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36 (1978), 669-683; and Marianne LaFrance and Barbara Carmen, "The Nonverbal Display of Psychological Androgyny," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38 (1980), 36-49.

[2]Gardner Murphy, Lois B. Murphy, and Theodore M. Newcomb, Experimental Social Psychology, rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1937), p. 918.

[3]Sandra L. Bem, "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42 (1974), 155-164; see also Janet T. Spence, Robert L. Helmreich, and Joy Stapp, "Ratings of Self and Peers on Sex Role Attributes and their Relation to Self Esteem and Conception of Masculinity and Femininity," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32 (1975), 29-39.

[4]Anne Constantinople, "Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum?" Psychological Bulletin, 80 (1973), 392.

[5]Bem, 155-156; see also Spence et al., 35, and Sandra L. Bem, "On the Utility of Alternative Procedures for Assessing Psychological Androgyny," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45 (1977), 204.

[6]Bem, "On the Utility . . ., 202-203.

[7]Spence et al., 38; see also Linda Cristall and Raymond S. Dean, "Relationship of Sex Role Stereotypes and Self-actualization," Psychological Reports, 39 (1976), 842.

[8]Sandra Bem and Ellen Lenney, "Sex Typing and Avoidance of Cross Sex Behavior," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33 (1976), 53.

[9]Cf., Gerald M. Phillips, "The Problem of Reticence," Pennsylvania Speech Annual, 1965, 22, 22-38; see also Gerald M. Phillips, "Reticence: Pathology of the Normal Speaker," Speech Monographs, 35 (1968), 39-49; and Gerald M. Phillips and Nancy J. Metzger, "The Reticent Syndrome: Some Theoretical Considerations about Etiology and Treatment," Speech Monographs, 40 (1973), 220-230.

[10]Cf., Allan Paivio, Alfred L. Baldwin, and Seymour M. Berger, "Measurement of Children's Sensitivity to Audiences," Child Development, 32 (1961), 721-730; see also Allan Paivio, "Childrearing Antecedents of Audience Sensitivity," Child Development, 35 (1964), 397-416.

[11]Cf., Judee K. Burgoon and Michael Burgoon, "Unwillingness to Communicate, Anomia-Alienation, and Communication Apprehension as Predictors of Small Group Communication," Journal of Psychology, 88 (1974), 32-38; see also Judee K. Burgoon, "The Unwillingness-to-Communicate Scale: Development and Validation," Communication Monographs, 43 (1976), 60-69.

[12]Theodore Clevenger, Jr., "A Synthesis of Experimental Research in Stage Fright," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 45 (1959), 134-145.

[13]James C. McCroskey, "Oral Communication Apprehension: A Summary of Recent Theory and Research," Human Communication Research, 4 (1977), 78-96; see also James C. McCroskey, "Measurement of Communication-bound Anxiety," Speech Monographs, 37 (1970), 269-277.

[14]McCroskey, "Oral Communication Apprehension," 78.

[15]Howard Gilkinson, "Social Fears as Reported by Students in College Speech Classes," Speech Monographs, 9 (1942), 154-155.

[16]Clevenger, 140.

[17]D. Thomas Porter, "Self Report of Communication Apprehension and Autonomic Arousal (Heart Rate): A Test of Construct Validity," Speech Monographs, 41 (1974), 275-276.

[18]Bruskin Associates, "What Are Americans Afraid of?" The Bruskin Report, 1973, No. 53.

[19]Peter A. Anderson, Janis F. Anderson, and John P. Garrison,

"Singing and Talking Apprehension: The Development of Two Constructs," Sign Language Studies, 19 (1978), 168.

[20]John P. Garrison and Karen R. Garrison, "Measurement of Oral Communication Apprehension Among Children: A Factor in the Development of Basic Speech Skills," Communication Education, 28 (1979), 124-126.

[21]Cf., Myron W. Lustig, "Verbal Reticence: A Reconceptualization and Preliminary Scale Development," paper presented to the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, 1974; see also William B. Snavely, George E. Merker, Linda L. Becker, and Virginia A. Book, "Predictors of Interpersonal Communication Apprehension in the Acquaintance Context," paper presented to the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, 1976.

[22]McCroskey, "Oral Communication Apprehension," 84.

[23]S. Scott Garrison, "The Sex Variable in Communication Research: Perspectives and Priorities for the Future," paper presented to the Fourth Annual Conference in Communication, Freson, California, May 1977.

[24]Alice H. Eagly, "Sex Differences in Influenceability," Psychological Reports, 85 (1978), 86-87.

[25]Gary Cronkhite, Persuasion: Speech and Behavioral Change (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), p. 136.

[26]Robert Bostrom and Alan Kemp, "Type of Speech, Sex of Speaker, and Sex of Subject as Factors Influencing Persuasion," Central States Speech Journal, 20 (1969), 245.

[27]Norman Markel, Joseph Long, and Thomas Saine, "Sex Effects in Conversational Interaction: Another Look at Male Dominance," Human Communication Research, 2 (1976), 363.

[28]Gerald R. Miller and Michael McReynolds, "Male Chauvinism and Source Competence: A Research Note," Speech Monographs, 40 (1973), 154-155.

[29]James Whittaker, "Consistency of Individual Differences in Persuasibility," Journal of Communication, 15 (1965), 33-34.

[30]Irving L. Janis and Peter B. Field, "Behavioral Assessment of Persuasibility: Consistencies of Individual Differences," in Personality and Persuasibility, edited by Carl I. Hovland and Irving L. Janis (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), pp. 29-54.

[31]Frank Sistrunk and John McDavid, "Sex Variable in Conforming Behavior," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17 (1971), 206.

[32]Lawrence B. Rosenfeld and Vicki M. Christie, "Sex and Persuasibility Revisited," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 38 (1974), 274.

[33]Only studies which were conducted in the U. S. were included in the analysis. Two additional studies were dropped from the analysis due to a lack of uniformity in the reported results. The selection of the dates was based on Rosenfeld and Christie's Table 1. It shows the last female-more-persuasible study as 1965 and the beginning of the NSD studies in 1968. The intervening two years were split between the two categories.

[34]Lynda Greenblatt, James F. Hasenauer, and Vicki S. Freimuth, "The Effect of Sex Typing and Androgyny on Two Communication Variables: Self Disclosure and Communication Apprehension," paper presented to the Speech Communication Association, Phoenix, 1977.

[35]Charles L. Montgomery and Michael Burgoon, "An Experimental Study of the Interaction Effects of Sex and Androgyny on Attitude Change," Communication Monographs, 44 (1977), 134.

[36]Charles L. Montgomery and Michael Burgoon, "The Effects of Androgyny and Message Expectation on Resistance to Persuasive Communication," Communication Monographs, 47 (1980), 66.

[37]Bem, "Measurement of Psychological Androgyny."

[38]McCroskey, "Measurement of Communication-bound Anxiety," 269-277.

[39]Janis and Field.

[40]Cf., Elazar J. Pedhazur and Toby J. Tetenbaum, "Bem Sex-Role Inventory: A Theoretical and Methodological Critique," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37 (1979), 996-1016; see also Anne Locksley and Mary Ellen Colten, "Psychological Androgyny: A Case of Mistaken Identity?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37 (1979), 1017-1031.

[41]Sandra Lipsitz Bem, "Theory and Measurement of Androgyny: A Reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten Critiques," Journal

of Personality and Social Psychology, 37 (1979), 1047-1053); see also Bem, "On the Utility . . ."; and Sandra Lipsitz Bem, "Gender Schema Theory: A Cognitive Account of Sex Typing," Psychological Review, 88 (1981), 354-364.

[42]Thomas M. Kimlickla, James A. Wakefield, Jr., and Alan F. Friedman, "Comparison of Factors from the Bem Sex-role Inventory for Male and Female College Students," Psychological Reports, 46 (1980), 1011-1017; see also Carrie Wherry Waters, L. K. Waters, and Steven Pincus, "Factor Analysis of the Masculine and Feminine Sex-typed Items on the Bem Sex-role Inventory," Psychological Reports, 40 (1977), 567-570; and Patrice Gaudreau, "Factor Analysis of the Bem Sex-role Inventory," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45 (1977), 299-302.

[43]A seminal work on content-bound persuasibility effects is S. E. Asch, Helen Block, and Max Hertzman, "Studies in the Principles of Judgements and Attitudes: I. Two Basic Principles of Judgement," Journal of Psychology, 5 (1938), 251.

[44]Irving L. Janis and Peter B. Field, "Sex Differences and Personality Factors Related to Persuasibility," in Personality and Persuasibility, edited by Carl I. Hovland and Irving L. Janis (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), pp. 55-68; see also Whittaker; and R. C. Adams, "A Factor Analytic Investigation of Some Personality and Intellectual Correlates of Persuasibility," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 1971.

[45]Adams, pp. 67-73.

[46]Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Bent, SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), pp. 398-433 and 293-300.

[47]In a separate, prior analysis of a portion of these data (Gary A. Copeland, "Sex Versus Sex-role Constructs in Communication Research: A Comparative Study," unpublished M. A. thesis, California State University, Fresno, California, 1979), androgynous and undifferentiated respondents were not found to differ significantly on PRCA responses, therefore they were not separated for this analysis.

[48]Eleanor Emmons Maccoby and Carol Jacklin, The Psychology of Sex Differences (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974), p. 4.

Table 1

A Gender by Sex-type Display of Mean Scores for (a) PRCA and (b) JFPT Responses

a) PRCA Response Means

	Masculine Typed	Masculine Tending	Androgynous Undifferentiated	Feminine Tending	Feminine Typed	Gender Totals
Males	46.00	50.15	53.73	54.67	66.00	51.29
Females	43.00	52.75	51.20	63.10	64.33	58.90
Sex Types	45.63	50.76	52.27	61.15	64.41	55.80

b) JFPT Response Means

Males	5.00	11.69	6.73	12.67	7.00	8.74
Females	6.00	8.75	9.33	15.30	13.14	11.96
Sex Types	5.13	11.00	8.23	14.69	12.86	10.65